DCI/IC-3006/74
29 October 1974

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Discussion with Major George ("Chip") Pickett,
24 October 1974

A. Murphy Commission Paper

1. Chip Pickett, who works with Andy Marshall, has been
requested by the Murphy Commission to provide comments on a specific
intelligence related resource paper prepared by John Macy for the
Commission. Instead, Chip advised he plans to write a different type
paper built around several general issues.

2. We went over his outline of issues which range from the DCI
role in budget review to long-range planning needs. Some of his
observations on the issues were historic and out-paced. I advised Chip
of our preliminary thinking toward presentation of National Intelligence
Strategies for collection and analysis buttressed by planning of SIGINT
and Imagery systems for out-year needs. To his concern over improving
DCI reporting, I noted the concept of a DCI Annual Report to the President
and explained that a first effort was under way to serve both the President
and PFIAB. I advised that inputs from all Intelligence Community elements
except State were in hand. I also noted that these materials would be useful
in preparing Congressional material. Chip's view that there is the require-
ment to do better cross-program evaluation is a correct one but he agreed
that we basically lack tools to accomplish this apples and pears value judg-
ment in a non-intuitive fashion. In response to Chip's issue over short-
falls in intelligence methodologies, I advised that he was incorrect in his
basic assumption that nothing was on-going. I noted the wide variety of
work under way and applied on new analytic methodologies and also in data
handling, e.g., SAFE, [   ]COINS, etc. I also noted steps   STAT
being taken in the warning area (the nervous system) on which considerable
time and resources were focused. Other matters were touched upon and
Pickett seemed appreciative.

2   Signed

3. Nevertheless I took the opportunity to firmly state my own reservations over the Murphy Commission's present focus on the intelligence resource question. I observed that the content of his outline was pitched in too much managerial detail and clearly beyond what I could read into the Commission's charter or the intent of Murphy in his letter to the DCI. He agreed that my concerns were correct. He stated that he would make the point in the introduction to his paper and also adjust his pitch particularly to account for the national strategy theme and some thoughts we exchanged about introducing market mechanisms into the IC system. As a further checkpoint, he plans to pass his paper over Tom Latimer's desk and review it with me before forwarding it to the Commission.

B. Intelligence Support to Net Assessments

1. Chip also asked for suggestions on how best to "nudge" the Intelligence Community for intelligence support to net assessments.

STATINTL He explained that [   ] had asked him to suggest ways to do this. I suggested that the case be made to General Wilson as Chairman of the Working Group of NSCIC. I noted that Andy and Wilson had not yet met and that a previous briefing session had been cancelled by Andy. A second course proposed would be through Deputy Secretary Clements presenting the needs (as a user) to the NSCIC. Lastly, Secretary Schlesinger could write to the DCI setting down his own views on the importance to net assessments of intelligence support. Chip seemed to favor the last approach. I explained to Chip the pressure of other important user needs on the Community's analytic base. I questioned whether the Community can get at the "soft" aspects of Soviet and Warsaw Pact military, e.g., training, rotations, incentives, etc. without considerable man-years of work and therefore the need to spell out the user's intended employment of the material in planning or decision processes would be helpful to us in setting priorities. I sensed from comments made that Marshall is concerned, particularly over DIA's analytic ability to be responsive.

STATINTL

AD/DCI/IC